2008-2009 SES EVALUATION REPORT

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

PROVIDER NAME: Huntington Learning Centers

DISTRICTS SERVED: Monroe Cty. Com. Sch. Corp., MSD Shakamak, Spencer-Owen Com.

Sch. Corp.

OF STUDENTS SERVED*: 168 (English/Language Arts)

*DEFINED AS ATTENDING AT LEAST ONE SES SESSION

2008-2009 EVALUATION GRADES (see report below for details)

CUSTOMER SATISFACTION: A-

(How satisfied are districts, schools, and parents with the services that the provider offered)?

SERVICE DELIVERY: A+

(How well did the provider implement services, and to what extent did the provider implement its program with fidelity to its originally approved application)?

ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS: C-

(Is the provider increasing the academic achievement of the students it served)?

CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

PARENT REPORT

% of parents reporting: 29%

Overall score: 3.6 out of 4.0

DISTRICT REPORT

% of districts served reporting:

Overall score: 4.0 out of 4.0

PRINCIPAL REPORT

% of principals reporting: 50%

Overall Score: 3.1 out of 4.0

CUSTOMER SATISFACTION GRADE: A-

SERVICE DELIVERY

| PARENT REPORT | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| % of parents reporting: | 29% | | |
| Overall score: | 3.6 out of 4.0 | | |
| DISTRICT REPORT: | | | |
| % of districts reporting: | 33% | | |
| Overall score: | 100% | | |
| PRINCIPAL REPORT: | | | |
| % of principals reporting: | 50% | | |
| Overall score: | 3.9 out of 4.0 | | |
| ONSITE MONITORING/COMPLIANCE: | 4.0 out of 4.0 | | |
| Go to (http://mustang.doe.in.gov/dg/ses/Evaluations-onsite-02008-2009 | 0809.cfm) to view the Onsite Monitoring Report from | | |
| SERVICE DELIVERY GRADE: | A + | | |
| ACADEMIC EFF | ECTIVENESS | | |
| COMPLETION RATE: | 51% (English/Language Arts) | | |
| TYPE OF ASSESSMENT USED BY PROVIDER: | CAT | | |
| % OF STUDENTS SHOWING GAINS ON PROVIDER ASSESSMENT: | 76% (English/Language Arts) | | |
| % OF STUDENTS WHO ATTENDED | | | |

62% (English/Language Arts)

80% OR MORE SESSIONS:

(Based on # attending 80% / # served who attended at least one session)

ISTEP+ DATA (included in academic effectiveness grade):

SES STUDENTS ONLY: ISTEP+ RESULTS

| Category | Huntington (E/LA) | All SES Students Statewide (E/LA)* | Huntington (Math) | All SES Students Statewide (Math)* |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| # of students | 46 | 2869 | n/a | 2823 |
| % showing improvement on ISTEP+** | 57% | 50% | n/a | 49% |

^{*}Includes all students participating in SES who completed 80% of their sessions and have ISTEP+ scores for both years.

SES AND NON-SES STUDENTS MATCHED: ISTEP+ RESULTS

| ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------|-----------|-------------|------------|--|--|
| | # | % Matched | % showing | change in | | |
| | Matched | | improvement | passing %* | | |
| SES | | | 55% | 0.0% | | |
| Not SES | 33 | 72% | 67% | 3.0% | | |

^{*}Change in passing percentage compares the two groups passing percentages from Fall 2008 to Spring 2009

Note that information provided in the ISTEP+ analysis represents descriptive statistics only (averages and percentages).

| Α(|
|--------------|
| ĽΑ |
| M |
| |
| Ľ. |
| V |
| \mathbf{I} |
| I(|
| ١. |
| E |
| H. |
| Н |
| E |
| L |
| " |
| ľ |
| \ |
| /] |
| Ľ |
| N |
| ١J |
| Ľ |
| S |
| S |
| (|
| ان |
| K. |
| А |
| L |
|)] |
| Ľ |
| : |
| |
| |

C-

OVERALL GRADE: B-

^{**}Improvement on ISTEP+ is defined as, for students who did not pass ISTEP+ in Fall 2008, getting closer to the ISTEP+ spring 2009 cut score, and for students passing ISTEP+ in Fall 2008, getting further away from the ISTEP+ spring 2009 cut score.